

Real Fight on Water Begins

New circumstances which have just developed in the long controversy with Arizona over water of the Colorado River make it imperative that all Californians clearly understand the issues. It is impossible intelligently to deal with a complex engineering and political question like this without appraising each new happening as it occurs. Lack of clear thinking or lack of interest at this point could result in deplorable results for all of Southern California.

Both ominous and encouraging developments have taken place in this latest phase of the fight. In Washington, the ominous matter was the approval by the Senate Insular and Interior Affairs Committee of a confusing bill which, in effect, gives approval to the \$738,000,000 Central Arizona Project subject to a determination of water rights by the Supreme Court. This bill is bad. There should be no connection whatever between the uneconomic and fantastically costly Central Arizona Project and the question of water rights in the Colorado.

Suppose, for instance, that Arizona should be awarded by the Supreme Court a certain amount of main stream water from the river; that has nothing to do with whether the Central Arizona Project is feasible or should be built. If the American taxpayer is to be saddled with the three-quarter of a billion dollar Arizona "rescue" plan to raise water 1000 feet and take it 250 miles, why is it any more justifiable merely because Arizona owns some water?

It would be worse than foolish, therefore, for California to be lulled into any lessening of opposition to the Central Arizona Project merely because the misleading Supreme Court rider has been attached to the bill. This is a deliberate device to becloud the major question. The only test to be applied to the Central Arizona Project is whether it conforms to reclamation standards, according to all the business practice of the past. If it does not, it should be rejected, regardless of the availability of water.

Another matter with which Arizona has

sought to muddy the logic of this whole issue concerns the fact that Southern California is not yet using much of its share of Colorado River water. The inference, from the Arizona viewpoint, seems to be that because we are not yet using the water, this weakens our right to the water.

Nothing could be more ridiculous. Los Angeles traditionally has planned for the future—and paid hard cash for its foresightedness—in regard to its water supply. In 1908, with a population of a mere 300,000 it began constructing the Owens River Aqueduct to take care of the future. In 1949, with the city's population at 2,000,000, the Owens River Aqueduct has just about reached its capacity. That was farsightedness. Should California in 1920, let us say, have been deprived of its Owens River water merely because it was not yet using it all? Again, in 1925 planning began for the Colorado River Aqueduct. In 1931, the job began. Of course, we are not yet using the full supply. Nobody expected that we would be. This Colorado Aqueduct was built for years to come, to take care of the future.

It is plain stupidity to try to base an argument on water rights on present water use. But Arizona, attempting desperately to cover up the pitiable weakness of her scheme, has tried to talk about everything but the facts involved, has sought to go off on pointless tangents.

California's strength lies in this: that her basic rights to Colorado River water are protected by solemn contracts with the Federal government, and that California not only has offered but is actively campaigning to have all water matters in dispute decided by the only agency empowered to do so, the Supreme Court.

The one great point to be kept in mind is that we must not permit ourselves or Congress to be gulled by any such obvious trick as is embodied in the Senate "compromise" bill. Let's decide water rights in the Colorado, yes. But let's not pretend that settlement of the rights automatically authorizes Arizona to grab \$738,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to "rescue" her Central Valley.

Two Points of Strength

Good and Bad News

There's No Connection

Hush, Hush, Hush! in the President's Parlor

When Sen. Millard E. Tydings (D) Md., left the secret-secret meeting at President Truman's quarters Thursday night, reporters asked him what the consistory was all about. The Senator said:

"If I told you, you wouldn't print it in the interests of the country."

The New York Times said in a dispatch we printed on Page 1 yesterday morning that the President conferred "with key policy men from Congress and the administration on the question of giving Great Britain technical information on the production of atomic bombs."

Now there is a stern Federal law, armed with threats of capital punishment, which forbids disclosure of atomic information to other countries. This law was examined and amended in public hearings and passed with general approval. It expressed a high policy of the United States and the people very properly followed the development of this policy, hearing it expounded in Congress and reading about its implications in their newspapers. It was their right to know what their government was doing in its most important military relationship with the rest of the world.

Our atomic policy cannot be changed without another act of Congress. But the supersecret meeting suggests that there is some attempt to run a fast one—to overwhelm Congressional leaders with a sense of urgency so that they will ram through some amendment to the atomic energy law before a breath can be drawn for objection and before the people know what's up.

Sen. Tydings' solemn—and no doubt sincere—remark reveals that the conference stage was well set to create a desperate, suprallegal atmosphere of urgency.

Sen. Jenner (R) Ind., was not taken in by the reports of the "grim-faced" con-

clave. Of course, he wasn't present and so could not be affected by the impressive props. Sen. Jenner snorted, according to the Associated Press, and said: "Grim-faced leaders! Isn't it about time we took the conduct of our own foreign relations into our own hands and tell the people the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?"

We do not go all the way with Sen. Jenner in his views on the Atlantic pact, but we think he is on the beam here.

The American proposals for international control of atomic developments through inspection were wise and generous. They were defeated by Russian obstinacy and suspicion—and perhaps more sinister motive. But they were applauded by the world outside of the Iron Curtain. The whole case for international control on our excellent terms would collapse if we peddled our bomb secrets to any one country, and the Russians would crow that they were right in their suspicions. Their case might not stand close inspection, but they would make an impression where it would harm us most.

If the President and his advisers actually are conspiring to give our bomb techniques to the British, they ought to tell the country plainly what they have in mind so that the people can blow the proposal down if they want to. The Socialists who govern England are sometimes dubious friends of the United States. Some of them believe that the welfare of the kind of world they want depends upon the destruction of the kind of world we have. Until things are seen more clearly—until Mr. Truman and his advisers present the case to the people instead of trying to frighten a handful of Congressmen—the question will recur and recur: Why add weight to the balance which the British could swing away from us if it served the Socialist plan?

The Steel Strike Is Off, but the Price May Be High

Following the surrender of the smaller companies, the Big Three of steel accepted the President's plan for a fact-finding board and so the threat of a strike is postponed for 60 days.

This is good news from one point of view, but may be bad from another. If the fact-finding board follows the pattern of those appointed by Mr. Truman in the past, it will yield to the union demands, not because they are just, but for the sake of peace at any price. And the public will pay the cost of appeasement in steel prices higher than they ought to be, and perhaps in a depression which a badly adjusted price structure could bring on.

Most of the companies which have ac-

cepted the President's plan, including U.S. Steel, Bethlehem and Republic, emphasize that they do not agree to be bound by the recommendations of the fact-finding board, and one, Inland, said its acceptance was conditional on the personnel of the board.

Phil Murray, president of the United Steelworkers, was jubilant at the outcome, and well he might be. The President took him off the hook. Murray is well aware that the strike would have been untimely, might have been lost and that the demands were unreasonable. But he had told his followers he would get them a boost in wages, pensions and sick benefits and he was bound to make the gamble. If the negotiations do not bring his union much he will have an alibi.



How About Lowering Your Sights, John?

LETTERS TO THE TIMES

A Freedom Slogan

In re Socialism's Threat to United States.

It is to be hoped that all Americans may read the substance of the speech quoted in your paper July 12 by Dr. George S. Benson, college president. It is sound, so American, and states the truth so vividly. That word "Socialism" attracts the attention of the disoriented; the visionary, and most all of the nitwits and especially the revolutionary minded.

Many people are born with revolutionary minds. They can't help it, but we can protect, and must protect, ourselves from that minority.

It is unfortunate that some politicians, in their intense desire for election to office, will wink the "red" eye at Socialists even though they have later to reverse their campaign talk.

I have been so impressed with a slogan adopted by a breakfast club to which I belong that I wish every one enjoying the American way of life might adopt it as a daily prayer. It is not copyrighted, is free to all, as are yet many things in America, and I quote: "Freedom as we have it in America is God's gift to us, and I mean to help maintain it with all my might."

L. R. WHARTON, Los Angeles.

Who's to Blame?

Isn't it strange, that it hasn't occurred to the doctors that they themselves are bringing about the thing that they are fighting—socialized medicine.

In the medical profession it's the specialists with high fees that are driving an ailing public to socialized medicine.

Have you ever interviewed one of those great men for about 15 minutes and had him hand

you a bill for \$25? Well I have, many times. I also have cooled my heels in a ritzy office for half an hour, then had the specialist grant me five minutes to tell me something I already knew, for which I handed a receptionist \$10—without even a sugar pill to assuage my injured feelings.

Considering the number of parts to the body—with a specialist attached to each part—and you don't happen to hit the right specialist for the right part the first try and have to go down the line at \$25 a throw—well, you can add.

Give us more general practitioners, the kind who have specialized in all parts of the anatomy (with the exception of the head), who gives you a thorough examination and a prescription for \$10—as in the good old days before specialists became thefad—and who send you away with a feeling of confidence and affection, and we will do without socialized medicine.

PEG NORRINGTON, Pasadena.

Punctuation Lament

So now it's farewell to the tide, that fascinating little way line over canon, La Canada and so on. For "the U.S. Board of Geographic Names has decided that the tide must go." Tide, you ban banished.

Next thing, these punks of punctuation will drive out the dire diacresis (or am I naive?) the peas and carrets, the silly asterisks and the cedillas (those lovely Spanish headresses for women). Smoke signals, here I come.

Now what will become of those old-time tennis rivals, Little Bill Johnston and Big Bill Tilde?

CORNELIUS VEZIN, La Crescenta.

GRIN AND BEAR IT

By Lichty



"Comrade agent in U.S. mentions new class of Capitalist oppressors . . . group called 'Bookies' taking much of workers' wages."

One Pension System

Much is written about the Townsend plan and all writers fail to tell us what is to become of the Federal Social Security old age pension plans now in effect.

I am for the Townsend plan but only under the Social Security name. There is no reason why the Social Security Act cannot be improved and enlarged to embody the Townsend plan and thus cover all persons past 65 years of age.

It does not seem sensible to have several Federal pension systems when all aged, including Army, Navy, Air Force men, also retired brass and politicians, could be pensioned under one system, reducing bookkeeping and expensive snooping.

A Federal pension system for all aged would eliminate State pensions and all the evils connected with them, such as sales taxes, salaried hordes of investigators and snoopers, also Federal contributions, and the oldsters would thus be free to change their place of residence instead of being compelled to live in a certain place to be entitled to State pension.

Sweden's new pension law includes all persons 67 years of age, rich and poor, pension law so enacted for purpose of eliminating investigators and snoopers.

Sen. Pepper of Florida has introduced a bill covering the \$156 per month Townsend pension and spending plan, in Congress, and I am sure his bill will never be enacted into law because it conflicts with the 12-year-old Social Security Act which Truman wants enlarged with old age payments increased.

C. G. LUNDIN, Los Angeles.

Sen. Taft and Moss

Two headlines in The Times July 12, "Statements Show Change in President's Attitude" and "Sen. Taft to Cast Vote Against Atlantic Pact," seem significant, in that they exemplify not only the difference in character of President Truman and Sen. Taft, but also typify the policy of their respective parties.

The President has shown that his opinion can change with the trend of national economy, while Sen. Taft still holds to the old Republican isolationist policy, which has long since been outdated.

How long will it take the Republican Party and Sen. Taft to realize the truth of the adage, "A rolling stone gathers no moss?"

DICK RUSSELL, Long Beach.

Pictures Recovered

I'm a little late in writing you my thanks for the article printed in your Mother's Day edition about me.

You will recall the article was about a mother robbed of her son's pictures while shopping downtown.

I feel it was due to the article the pictures are now in my possession.

MRS. ROSE ROTH, Los Angeles.

Los Angeles Has Enjoyed 35 Mayors in 100 Years

BY CHARLES E. HILLINGER

Dr. Alpheus P. Hodges should be quickly identified by citizens of Los Angeles almost as quickly as they identify George Washington. But the chances are that only a few of them recognize Hodges' name. He is to Los Angeles what Washington is to the country—the first chief executive.

On July 3, 1850, when the recently American-occupied "pequena ciudad" of Los Angeles (not yet part of the United States but no longer a part of the Mexican republic) had a civic function of much importance. Nearly all the citizens came to see Dr. Hodges, the first Mayor, and other officials swear to serve the people of the ciudad in the best interests of the State of California.

California wasn't a State yet and the ceremony was slightly premature but this was the beginning of city government and Young Dr. Hodges was the first of 35 Mayors. This month Los Angeles has had a century of Mayors.

In the beginning the Mayor's term of office was set at one year, and this rule remained in effect from 1850 to 1890. In that time the Mayor's salary was limited to a maximum of \$500 a year. This explains in part why Dr. Hodges served simultaneously as County Coroner, and why Stephen C. Foster was Mayor and School Superintendent at the same time.

During the 70s the city Zanjero (keeper of the ditches—protector of the city's water supplies) was on a higher level in matter of prestige and pay than the Mayor. Christobal Aguilera, an early Mayor, following both his terms of office became Zanjero. Another instance of insufficient wages, possibly.

Compensation became better in time. The Mayor's annual check was \$800 in 1858; \$3600 in 1897; \$4500 in 1919; \$10,000 in 1925; and today the annual effort is worth \$18,000 plus another \$4000 for travel expenses. The term of office was lengthened also. Henry Hazard served the first two-year term, 1890-92. In 1906 the tenure was changed and A. C. Harper was elected for three years. The Charter in 1909 changed the term back to two years and this remained in effect again until Mayor Bowron became the first elected four-year man in 1941.

Bowron, incidentally, now in his 11th year as chief executive, has served longer than any other previous Mayor. Meredith P. Snyder and George E. Cryer are tied for second place, each having served eight years. J. R. Toberman leads the list in number of terms. He was in office, six one-year terms during the 70s and 80s.

William D. Stephens holds the record in the short-term department. He succeeded A. C.

Harper who resigned, and served 11 days in March, 1909. Stephens was the most successful of our Mayors, politically speaking, as he later became Governor of California.

Other short-termers were Bernard Cohn who succeeded Dr. Fred McDougal and was in office for 18 days. John Bryson Sr. served two months, 11 days, from Dec. 10, 1888, to Feb. 21, 1889. A new city charter cut short his scheduled term.

Two Mayors have died in office, Henry Mellus in 1860, and Fred McDougal, in 1878. Those who resigned were S. C. Foster, A. C. Harper and Charles Sebastian. Foster resigned twice, the first time in 1855, with 12 days to go, so that he could participate in a lynching of a notorious murderer. The man was to be set free by the courts because of a legal technicality and Foster and others formed a vigilante committee to prevent the miscarriage of justice.

Two salient features in the history of our city fathers are the large number of men who have served and re-served after an interval of time. The other interesting item is their birthplaces.

As for the in-out-in personalities, John Nichols initiated the practice. He served in 1852 and '57-'59. S. C. Foster was Mayor in '54 and again in '56. Damien Marchessault was the man in '59, '61-'64 and '67. C. Aguilera in '66, '68 and '71-'72. J. R. Toberman served his six single terms in '73-'74 and '79-'82. The last member of this group is the most unusual, for M. P. Snyder was Mayor in '96-'98, 1900-04 and again 15 years later from 1919-21.

Of the 35 men who have served as Mayor of Los Angeles only Christobal Aguilera and Fred Eaton were born in this city and Fletcher Bowron is the only other native Californian.

City fathers have hailed from 15 States. California and Virginia lead the list with three each. Canada was the birthplace of Damien Marchessault, Prudent Beaudry, Owen McAleer and Frank Shaw. Other foreign-born Mayors were A. F. Coroneil of Mexico, Mascarel of France, E. F. Spence of Ireland, Bernard Cohn of Prussia and George Alexander of Scotland.

The youngest Mayor was Dr. Hodges, the first, who was elected when he was 28. Alexander was the oldest—70. The average age of Mayors at the time they were installed is 47.

A parting bit of information is the linguistic abilities of Jose Mascarel, the Marseille sea captain. Mascarel, who became Mayor and later a banker, couldn't carry on a conversation in English while he was in office. He spoke Spanish and French fluently, but hardly a word of English.

YESTERYEAR IN THE TIMES

SIXTY YEARS AGO

IN THE TIMES, JULY 16, 1889: CHICAGO—John F. Beggs, accused of complicity in the murder of Dr. Cronin, filed a new application for a writ of habeas corpus, contending that the State's Attorney attempted to intimidate him.

MILWAUKEE—The city proposed to go ahead with the GAR encampment, in spite of the refusal of many veterans to travel on railroads because they refused to grant rate reductions.

PARIS—Boulangier deputies attempted to speak before the Strasbourg Statue in the Place de la Concorde, but police interfered. A riot ensued.

BUFFALO—After fleeing across Midwestern States, Jake Kilrain reached the safety of New York. In Jackson, Miss., the referee and several others connected with the Sullivan-Kilrain prize fight gave themselves up and made bail.

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

IN THE TIMES, JULY 16, 1914: The Farmers and Fruit Growers Federation started a campaign to defeat the eight-hour constitutional amendment.

The tax rate was fixed at \$1.60 per \$100 assessed valuation.

MEXICO CITY—Huerta resigned the provisional Presidency and his offer was accepted by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies. Then Francisco Carbajal was named provisional President and took the oath.

Two Long Bridges

I have written to the gentleman from Missouri who sired the hysterical herring to this effect:

What this nation needs, as public works, two long bridges. 1—A bridge of ships, taken from the Navy's moth-ball fleet and loaded with food and supplies for Hawaii. 2—Bridges to Australia.

As to the personalities referred to above, my first name also is Harry. HARRY G. G. Pasadena.

Huerta blamed his troubles on President Wilson and spoke feelingly of the "outrage committed at Veracruz by the American Fleet." He left Mexico City by train for the coast. In Washington it was expected that the Mexican troubles would be pacified. The United States had refused to recognize Huerta, although he had held office against numerous other insurgents for 18 months.

FIFTEEN YEARS AGO

IN THE TIMES, JULY 16, 1934: Los Angeles traffic arrests fell off by half in June. The reason was attributed to the fact that so many police were on strike, duty at the harbor.

SAN FRANCISCO—Residents began fleeing the city under the threat of the general strike which would tie up all industry and normal activity. Mayor Rossi appealed to Gov. Merriam for additional State troops to support the 2000 on duty. Gov. Merriam attributed the agitation to Communists. The general strike committee began organizing food depots and the like, planning a long pull.

THE TIMES-MIRROR COMPANY

NORMAN CHANDLER, President and Publisher
MARIAN OTIS CHANDLER, Chairman of the Board
HARRISON CHANDLER, Vice-President
PHILIP CHANDLER, Vice-President and General Manager
L. D. HOTCHKISS, Editor
RICHARD C. ADAMS, Secretary
HARRY W. BOWERS, Treasurer
Los Angeles Times
EVERY MORNING IN THE YEAR
DAILY FOUNDED DEC. 4, 1881, 68th YEAR
HARRISON CHANDLER, 1881-1917
HARRY CHANDLER, 1917-1944
OFFICES
Times Building, 1st & Spring (53) MA 2545
Washington Office, 1217-1219 National Press Club Bldg. (4)
NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE
Cresner & Woodward, Inc.
Chicago Office, 350 North Michigan Ave. (11)
New York Office, 22 East 40th Street (16)
Detroit Office, New Center Bldg. (2)
San Francisco Office, 681 Market Street (51)

The Times cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts. No payment is made for verse.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all the local news printed in this newspaper as well as all AP news dispatches.

A THOUGHT FROM THE BIBLE

For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith.—Romans 1, 17.

Real Fight on Water Begins

New circumstances which have just developed in the long controversy with Arizona over water of the Colorado River make it imperative that all Californians clearly understand the issues. It is impossible intelligently to deal with a complex engineering and political question like this without appraising each new happening as it occurs. Lack of clear thinking or lack of interest at this point could result in deplorable results for all of Southern California.

Both ominous and encouraging developments have taken place in this latest phase of the fight. In Washington, the ominous matter was the approval by the Senate Insular and Interior Affairs Committee of a confusing bill which, in effect, gives approval to the \$738,000,000 Central Arizona Project subject to a determination of water rights by the Supreme Court. This bill is bad. There should be no connection whatever between the uneconomic and fantastically costly Central Arizona Project and the question of water rights in the Colorado.

Suppose, for instance, that Arizona should be awarded by the Supreme Court a certain amount of main stream water from the river; that has nothing to do with whether the Central Arizona Project is feasible or should be built. If the American taxpayer is to be saddled with the three-quarter of a billion dollar Arizona "rescue" plan to raise water 1000 feet and take it 250 miles, why is it any more justifiable merely because Arizona owns some water?

It would be worse than foolish, therefore, for California to be lulled into any lessening of opposition to the Central Arizona Project merely because the misleading Supreme Court rider has been attached to the bill. This is a deliberate device to becloud the major question. The only test to be applied to the Central Arizona Project is whether it conforms to reclamation standards, according to all the business practice of the past. If it does not, it should be rejected, regardless of the availability of water.

Another matter with which Arizona has

sought to muddy the logic of this whole issue concerns the fact that Southern California is not yet using much of its share of Colorado River water. The inference, from the Arizona viewpoint, seems to be that because we are not yet using the water, this weakens our right to the water.

Nothing could be more ridiculous. Los Angeles traditionally has planned for the future—and paid hard cash for its foresightedness—in regard to its water supply. In 1908, with a population of a mere 300,000 it began constructing the Owens River Aqueduct to take care of the future. In 1949, with the city's population at 2,000,000, the Owens River Aqueduct has just about reached its capacity. That was farsightedness. Should California in 1920, let us say, have been deprived of its Owens River water merely because it was not yet using it all? Again, in 1925 planning began for the Colorado River Aqueduct. In 1931, the job began. Of course, we are not yet using the full supply. Nobody expected that we would be. This Colorado Aqueduct was built for years to come, to take care of the future.

It is plain stupidity to try to base an argument on water rights on present water use. But Arizona, attempting desperately to cover up the pitiable weakness of her scheme, has tried to talk about everything but the facts involved, has sought to go off on pointless tangents.

California's strength lies in this: that her basic rights to Colorado River water are protected by solemn contracts with the Federal government, and that California not only has offered but is actively campaigning to have all water matters in dispute decided by the only agency empowered to do so, the Supreme Court.

The one great point to be kept in mind is that we must not permit ourselves or Congress to be gulled by any such obvious trick as is embodied in the Senate "compromise" bill. Let's decide water rights in the Colorado, yes. But let's not pretend that settlement of the rights automatically authorizes Arizona to grab \$738,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to "rescue" her Central Valley.

Two Points of Strength

Good and Bad News

There's No Connection

Hush, Hush, Hush! in the President's Parlor

When Sen. Millard E. Tydings (D) Md., left the secret-secret meeting at President Truman's quarters Thursday night, reporters asked him what the consistory was all about. The Senator said:

"If I told you, you wouldn't print it in the interests of the country."

The New York Times said in a dispatch we printed on Page 1 yesterday morning that the President conferred "with key policy men from Congress and the administration on the question of giving Great Britain technical information on the production of atomic bombs."

Now there is a stern Federal law, armed with threats of capital punishment, which forbids disclosure of atomic information to other countries. This law was examined and amended in public hearings and passed with general approval. It expressed a high policy of the United States and the people very properly followed the development of this policy, hearing it expounded in Congress and reading about its implications in their newspapers. It was their right to know what their government was doing in its most important military relationship with the rest of the world.

Our atomic policy cannot be changed without another act of Congress. But the supersecret meeting suggests that there is some attempt to run a fast one—to overwhelm Congressional leaders with a sense of urgency so that they will ram through some amendment to the atomic energy law before a breath can be drawn for objection and before the people know what's up.

Sen. Tydings' solemn—and no doubt sincere—remark reveals that the conference stage was well set to create a desperate, suprallegal atmosphere of urgency.

Sen. Jenner (R) Ind., was not taken in by the reports of the "grim-faced" con-

clave. Of course, he wasn't present and so could not be affected by the impressive props. Sen. Jenner snorted, according to the Associated Press, and said: "Grim-faced leaders! Isn't it about time we took the conduct of our own foreign relations into our own hands and tell the people the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?"

We do not go all the way with Sen. Jenner in his views on the Atlantic pact, but we think he is on the beam here.

The American proposals for international control of atomic developments through inspection were wise and generous. They were defeated by Russian obstinacy and suspicion—and perhaps more sinister motive. But they were applauded by the world outside of the Iron Curtain. The whole case for international control on our excellent terms would collapse if we peddled our bomb secrets to any one country, and the Russians would crow that they were right in their suspicions. Their case might not stand close inspection, but they would make an impression where it would harm us most.

If the President and his advisers actually are conspiring to give our bomb techniques to the British, they ought to tell the country plainly what they have in mind so that the people can blow the proposal down if they want to. The Socialists who govern England are sometimes dubious friends of the United States. Some of them believe that the welfare of the kind of world they want depends upon the destruction of the kind of world we have. Until things are seen more clearly—until Mr. Truman and his advisers present the case to the people instead of trying to frighten a handful of Congressmen—the question will recur and recur: Why add weight to the balance which the British could swing away from us if it served the Socialist plan?

The Steel Strike Is Off, but the Price May Be High

Following the surrender of the smaller companies, the Big Three of steel accepted the President's plan for a fact-finding board and so the threat of a strike is postponed for 60 days.

This is good news from one point of view, but may be bad from another. If the fact-finding board follows the pattern of those appointed by Mr. Truman in the past, it will yield to the union demands, not because they are just, but for the sake of peace at any price. And the public will pay the cost of appeasement in steel prices higher than they ought to be, and perhaps in a depression which a badly adjusted price structure could bring on.

Most of the companies which have ac-

cepted the President's plan, including U.S. Steel, Bethlehem and Republic, emphasize that they do not agree to be bound by the recommendations of the fact-finding board, and one, Inland, said its acceptance was conditional on the personnel of the board.

Phil Murray, president of the United Steelworkers, was jubilant at the outcome, and well he might be. The President took him off the hook. Murray is well aware that the strike would have been untimely, might have been lost and that the demands were unreasonable. But he had told his followers he would get them a boost in wages, pensions and sick benefits and he was bound to make the gamble. If the negotiations do not bring his union much he will have an alibi.



How About Lowering Your Sights, John?

LETTERS TO THE TIMES

A Freedom Slogan

In re Socialism's Threat to United States.

It is to be hoped that all Americans may read the substance of the speech quoted in your paper July 12 by Dr. George S. Benson, college president. It is sound, so American, and states the truth so vividly. That word "Socialism" attracts the attention of the disoriented; the visionary, and most all of the nitwits and especially the revolutionary minded.

Many people are born with revolutionary minds. They can't help it, but we can protect, and must protect, ourselves from that minority.

It is unfortunate that some politicians, in their intense desire for election to office, will wink the "red" eye at Socialists even though they have later to reverse their campaign talk.

I have been so impressed with a slogan adopted by a breakfast club to which I belong that I wish every one enjoying the American way of life might adopt it as a daily prayer. It is not copyrighted, is free to all, as are yet many things in America, and I quote: "Freedom as we have it in America is God's gift to us, and I mean to help maintain it with all my might."

L. R. WHARTON, Los Angeles.

Who's to Blame?

Isn't it strange, that it hasn't occurred to the doctors that they themselves are bringing about the thing that they are fighting—socialized medicine.

In the medical profession it's the specialists with high fees that are driving an ailing public to socialized medicine.

Have you ever interviewed one of those great men for about 15 minutes and had him hand

you a bill for \$25? Well I have, many times. I also have cooled my heels in a ritzy office for half an hour, then had the specialist grant me five minutes to tell me something I already knew, for which I handed a receptionist \$10—without even a sugar pill to assuage my injured feelings.

Considering the number of parts to the body—with a specialist attached to each part—and you don't happen to hit the right specialist for the right part the first try and have to go down the line at \$25 a throw—well, you can add.

Give us more general practitioners, the kind who have specialized in all parts of the anatomy (with the exception of the head), who gives you a thorough examination and a prescription for \$10—as in the good old days before specialists became thefad—and who send you away with a feeling of confidence and affection, and we will do without socialized medicine.

PEG NORRINGTON, Pasadena.

Punctuation Lament

So now it's farewell to the tilde, that fascinating little wavy line over canon, La Canada and so on. For "the U.S. Board of Geographic Names has decided that the tilde must go." Tilde, you ban banished.

Next thing, these punks of punctuation will drive out the dire diacresis (or am I naive?) the peas and carrets, the silly asterisks and the cedillas (those lovely Spanish headresses for women). Smoke signals, here I come.

Now what will become of those old-time tennis rivals, Little Bill Johnston and Big Bill Tilde?

CORNELIUS VEZIN, La Crescenta.

GRIN AND BEAR IT

By Lichty



"Comrade agent in U.S. mentions new class of Capitalist oppressors . . . group called 'Bookies' taking much of workers' wages."

One Pension System

Much is written about the Townsend plan and all writers fail to tell us what is to become of the Federal Social Security old age pension plans now in effect.

I am for the Townsend plan but only under the Social Security name. There is no reason why the Social Security Act cannot be improved and enlarged to embody the Townsend plan and thus cover all persons past 65 years of age.

It does not seem sensible to have several Federal pension systems when all aged, including Army, Navy, Air Force men, also retired brass and politicians, could be pensioned under one system, reducing bookkeeping and expensive snooping.

A Federal pension system for all aged would eliminate State pensions and all the evils connected with them, such as sales taxes, salaried hordes of investigators and snoopers, also Federal contributions, and the oldsters would thus be free to change their place of residence instead of being compelled to live in a certain place to be entitled to State pension.

Sweden's new pension law includes all persons 67 years of age, rich and poor, pension law so enacted for purpose of eliminating investigators and snoopers.

Sen. Pepper of Florida has introduced a bill covering the \$156 per month Townsend pension and spending plan, in Congress, and I am sure his bill will never be enacted into law because it conflicts with the 12-year-old Social Security Act which Truman wants enlarged with old age payments increased.

C. G. LUNDIN, Los Angeles.

Sen. Taft and Moss

Two headlines in The Times July 12, "Statements Show Change in President's Attitude" and "Sen. Taft to Cast Vote Against Atlantic Pact," seem significant, in that they exemplify not only the difference in character of President Truman and Sen. Taft, but also typify the policy of their respective parties.

The President has shown that his opinion can change with the trend of national economy, while Sen. Taft still holds to the old Republican isolationist policy, which has long since been outdated.

How long will it take the Republican Party and Sen. Taft to realize the truth of the adage, "A rolling stone gathers no moss?"

DICK RUSSELL, Long Beach.

Pictures Recovered

I'm a little late in writing you my thanks for the article printed in your Mother's Day edition about me.

You will recall the article was about a mother robbed of her son's pictures while shopping downtown.

I feel it was due to the article the pictures are now in my possession.

MRS. ROSE ROTH, Los Angeles.

Los Angeles Has Enjoyed 35 Mayors in 100 Years

BY CHARLES E. HILLINGER

Dr. Alpheus P. Hodges should be quickly identified by citizens of Los Angeles almost as quickly as they identify George Washington. But the chances are that only a few of them recognize Hodges' name. He is to Los Angeles what Washington is to the country—the first chief executive.

On July 3, 1850, when the recently American-occupied "pequena ciudad" of Los Angeles (not yet part of the United States but no longer a part of the Mexican republic) had a civic function of much importance. Nearly all the citizens came to see Dr. Hodges, the first Mayor, and other officials swear to serve the people of the ciudad in the best interests of the State of California.

California wasn't a State yet and the ceremony was slightly premature but this was the beginning of city government and Young Dr. Hodges was the first of 35 Mayors. This month Los Angeles has had a century of Mayors.

In the beginning the Mayor's term of office was set at one year, and this rule remained in effect from 1850 to 1890. In that time the Mayor's salary was limited to a maximum of \$500 a year. This explains in part why Dr. Hodges served simultaneously as County Coroner, and why Stephen C. Foster was Mayor and School Superintendent at the same time.

During the 70s the city Zanjero (keeper of the ditches—protector of the city's water supplies) was on a higher level in matter of prestige and pay than the Mayor. Christobal Aguilera, an early Mayor, following both his terms of office became Zanjero. Another instance of insufficient wages, possibly.

Compensation became better in time. The Mayor's annual check was \$800 in 1858; \$3600 in 1897; \$4500 in 1919; \$10,000 in 1925; and today the annual effort is worth \$18,000 plus another \$4000 for travel expenses. The term of office was lengthened also. Henry Hazard served the first two-year term, 1890-92. In 1906 the tenure was changed and A. C. Harper was elected for three years. The Charter in 1909 changed the term back to two years and this remained in effect again until Mayor Bowron became the first elected four-year man in 1941.

Bowron, incidentally, now in his 11th year as chief executive, has served longer than any other previous Mayor. Meredith P. Snyder and George E. Cryer are tied for second place, each having served eight years. J. R. Toberman leads the list in number of terms. He was in office, six one-year terms during the 70s and 80s.

William D. Stephens holds the record in the short-term department. He succeeded A. C.

Harper who resigned, and served 11 days in March, 1909. Stephens was the most successful of our Mayors, politically speaking, as he later became Governor of California.

Other short-termers were Bernard Cohn who succeeded Dr. Fred McDougal and was in office for 18 days. John Bryson Sr. served two months, 11 days, from Dec. 10, 1888, to Feb. 21, 1889. A new city charter cut short his scheduled term.

Two Mayors have died in office, Henry Mellus in 1860, and Fred McDougal, in 1878. Those who resigned were S. C. Foster, A. C. Harper and Charles Sebastian. Foster resigned twice, the first time in 1855, with 12 days to go, so that he could participate in a lynching of a notorious murderer. The man was to be set free by the courts because of a legal technicality and Foster and others formed a vigilante committee to prevent the miscarriage of justice.

Two salient features in the history of our city fathers are the large number of men who have served and re-served after an interval of time. The other interesting item is their birthplaces.

As for the in-out-in personalities, John Nichols initiated the practice. He served in 1852 and '57-'59. S. C. Foster was Mayor in '54 and again in '56. Damien Marchessault was the man in '59, '61-'64 and '67. C. Aguilera in '66, '68 and '71-'72. J. R. Toberman served his six single terms in '73-'74 and '79-'82. The last member of this group is the most unusual, for M. P. Snyder was Mayor in '96-'98, 1900-04 and again 15 years later from 1919-21.

Of the 35 men who have served as Mayor of Los Angeles only Christobal Aguilera and Fred Eaton were born in this city and Fletcher Bowron is the only other native Californian.

City fathers have hailed from 15 States. California and Virginia lead the list with three each. Canada was the birthplace of Damien Marchessault, Prudent Beaudry, Owen McAleer and Frank Shaw. Other foreign-born Mayors were A. F. Coroneil of Mexico, Mascarel of France, E. F. Spence of Ireland, Bernard Cohn of Prussia and George Alexander of Scotland.

The youngest Mayor was Dr. Hodges, the first, who was elected when he was 28. Alexander was the oldest—70. The average age of Mayors at the time they were installed is 47.

A parting bit of information is the linguistic abilities of Jose Mascarel, the Marseille sea captain. Mascarel, who became Mayor and later a banker, couldn't carry on a conversation in English while he was in office. He spoke Spanish and French fluently, but hardly a word of English.

YESTERYEAR IN THE TIMES

SIXTY YEARS AGO

IN THE TIMES, JULY 16, 1889:

CHICAGO—John F. Beggs, accused of complicity in the murder of Dr. Cronin, filed a new application for a writ of habeas corpus, contending that the State's Attorney attempted to intimidate him.

MILWAUKEE—The city proposed to go ahead with the GAR encampment, in spite of the refusal of many veterans to travel on railroads because they refused to grant rate reductions.

PARIS—Boulangier deputies attempted to speak before the Strasbourg Statue in the Place de la Concorde, but police interfered. A riot ensued.

BUFFALO—After fleeing across Midwestern States, Jake Kilrain reached the safety of New York. In Jackson, Miss., the referee and several others connected with the Sullivan-Kilrain prize fight gave themselves up and made bail.

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

IN THE TIMES, JULY 16, 1914:

The Farmers and Fruit Growers Federation started a campaign to defeat the eight-hour constitutional amendment.

The tax rate was fixed at \$1.60 per \$100 assessed valuation.

MEXICO CITY—Huerta resigned the provisional Presidency and his offer was accepted by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies. Then Francisco Carbajal was named provisional President and took the oath.

Two Long Bridges

I have written to the gentleman from Missouri who sired the hysterical herring to this effect:

What this nation needs, as public works, two long bridges. 1—A bridge of ships, taken from the Navy's moth-ball fleet and loaded with food and supplies for Hawaii. 2—Bridges to Australia.

As to the personalities referred to above, my first name also is Harry. HARRY G. G. Pasadena.

Huerta blamed his troubles on President Wilson and spoke feelingly of the "outrage committed at Veracruz by the American Fleet." He left Mexico City by train for the coast. In Washington it was expected that the Mexican troubles would be pacified. The United States had refused to recognize Huerta, although he had held office against numerous other insurgents for 18 months.

FIFTEEN YEARS AGO

IN THE TIMES, JULY 16, 1934:

Los Angeles traffic arrests fell off by half in June. The reason was attributed to the fact that so many police were on strike, duty at the harbor.

SAN FRANCISCO—Residents began fleeing the city under the threat of the general strike which would tie up all industry and normal activity. Mayor Rossi appealed to Gov. Merriam for additional State troops to support the 2000 on duty. Gov. Merriam attributed the agitation to Communists. The general strike committee began organizing food depots and the like, planning a long pull.

THE TIMES-MIRROR COMPANY

NORMAN CHANDLER, President and Publisher
MARIAN OTIS CHANDLER, Chairman of the Board
HARRISON CHANDLER, Vice-President
PHILIP CHANDLER, Vice-President and General Manager
L. D. HOTCHKISS, Editor
RICHARD C. ADAMS, Secretary
HARRY W. BOWERS, Treasurer
Los Angeles Times
EVERY MORNING IN THE YEAR
DAILY FOUNDED DEC. 4, 1881, 68th YEAR
HARRISON CHANDLER, 1881-1917
HARRY CHANDLER, 1917-1944
OFFICES
Times Building, 1st & Spring (53) MA 2545
Washington Office, 1217-1219 National Press Club Bldg. (4)
NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE
Cresner & Woodward, Inc.
Chicago Office, 350 North Michigan Ave. (11)
New York Office, 22 East 40th Street (16)
Detroit Office, New Center Bldg. (2)
San Francisco Office, 681 Market Street (51)

The Times cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts. No payment is made for verse.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all the local news printed in this newspaper as well as all AP news dispatches.

A THOUGHT FROM THE BIBLE

For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith.—Romans 1, 17.